



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,633	12/17/2003	Seoung Cheoun Kim	SI-0049	3828

34610 7590 04/29/2005

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,633

Applicant(s)

KIM, SEOUNG CHEOUN

Examiner

Barry W Taylor

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants own admittance in view of O'Neil et al (4,296,282 hereinafter O'Neil).

Regarding claim 1. Applicants admitted prior art teaches a call pick-up system (see Applicants figure 1) of a switching device, comprising:

a subscriber call process block (see item 11 figure 1) for performing a call pick-up function in the switching device.

Applicants disclose that prior art call pick-up systems do not use a caller information analysis block (see Applicants specification paragraphs 16 and 56, see difference between prior art (i.e. figure 1) and Applicants claimed invention (i.e. figure 3) is item 65 now appearing in figure 3 which is labeled "Caller information analysis block").

O'Neil also teaches a call pick arrangement (title, abstract, column 1) wherein each station can answer another stations call belonging to same group (col. 1 lines 5-35, col. 4 line 63 – col. 5 line 31). O'Neil discloses using caller identification information enables the answering party to know who the caller is, as well as, the identity of the originally called station that is unavailable to take call (col. 1 lines 5-35).

It would have been obvious to any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of O'Neil into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art in order to notify the person answering the call who the original called station was thereby eliminating the confusion as disclosed by O'Neil (col. 1 lines 24-35).

Regarding claims 2 and 6. O'Neil teaches using caller identification to identify both the calling and called stations (abstract, col. 1 lines 5-35).

Regarding claim 4. Applicants admit that prior art already teaches a call process common block (item 11 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure);

a digit analysis block (see item 13 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure and paragraph 4):

a ring search block (see item 14 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure and paragraph 5); and

a LCD control block (see item 12 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure and paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 5. Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 4 since claim 5 is the combination of claims 1 and 4.

Method claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as system claims 1 and 5 since the recited apparatus would perform the claimed method steps.

2. Claims 3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants own admittance in view of O'Neil et al (4,296,282 hereinafter O'Neil) further in view of Lee (5,859,903).

Regarding claims 3 and 7. O'Neil does not explicitly teaches caller information table includes the caller information and the subscriber telephone number and assigns a unique identifier number to each caller's number.

Lee teaches a caller identification method in a call pick-up system (abstract) wherein name and message from caller is displayed (column 1), as well as, displaying a caller identification on a display device in case when a caller from an office line hangs up the call (col. 1 lines 15-25, col. 2 lines 15-29). Lee also uses a unique identifier (see "#1" in table 1, column 3 assigned to the name "Lee Jung Sung" and telephone number "321-7654") to store caller identification information so that subscribers can retrieve at a later time (col. 4 line 30 – col. 6 line 67) or redial by simple press of dial key.

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Lee into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art in view of O'Neil in order to provide a more user-friendly system that allows subscribers the ability to redial by simple press of button.

Regarding claim 9. O'Neil does not teach caller information includes caller's telephone number or name.

Lee teaches a caller identification method in a call pick-up system (abstract) wherein name and message from caller is displayed (column 1), as well as, displaying a caller identification on a display device in case when a caller from an office line hangs up the call (col. 1 lines 15-25, col. 2 lines 15-29). Lee also uses a unique identifier (see "#1" in table 1, column 3 assigned to the name "Lee Jung Sung" and telephone number

Art Unit: 2643

"321-7654") to store caller identification information so that subscribers can retrieve at a later time (col. 4 line 30 – col. 6 line 67) or redial by simple press of dial key.

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Lee into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art in view of O'Neil in order to provide a more user-friendly system that allows subscribers the ability to redial by simple press of button.

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants own admittance in view of O'Neil et al (4,296,282 hereinafter O'Neil) further in view of Ardon (5,815,563).

Regarding claim 10. Applicants admit that prior art already teaches using a call pick-up feature code (see at least paragraphs 4-16 of Applicants originally filed specification) but fail to teach transmitting message to specific caller (see Applicants originally filed specification paragraph 16).

Ardon also teaches a call pick-up system (title and abstract) wherein subscribers uses feature pick-up code (see "*5" columns 3-5) to indicate desire to answer call at remote location (col. 4 lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Ardon into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art and O'Neil in order to provide a more flexible system that allows subscribers the ability to answer calls at remote location or forward call to another location to be answered by someone else as taught by Ardon (col. 1 lines 19-31 and col. 4 lines 8-20).

4. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants own admittance in view of O'Neil et al (4,296,282 hereinafter O'Neil) and Ardon (5,815,563 further in view of Lee (5,859,903).

Regarding claims 11-13. O'Neil does not explicitly teaches caller information table includes the caller information and the subscriber telephone number and assigns a unique identifier number to each caller's number.

Lee teaches a caller identification method in a call pick-up system (abstract) wherein name and message from caller is displayed (column 1), as well as, displaying a caller identification on a display device in case when a caller from an office line hangs up the call (col. 1 lines 15-25, col. 2 lines 15-29). Lee also uses a unique identifier (see "#1" in table 1, column 3 assigned to the name "Lee Jung Sung" and telephone number "321-7654") to store caller identification information so that subscribers can retrieve at a later time (col. 4 line 30 – col. 6 line 67) or redial by simple press of dial key.

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Lee into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art in view of O'Neil and Ardon in order to provide a more user-friendly system that allows subscribers the ability to redial by simple press of button.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor, telephone number (571) 272-7509, who is available Monday-Friday, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached at (571) 272-7499. The facsimile phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2643

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barry W. Taylor", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Barry W. Taylor
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2600
Art Unit 2643